

File : ODA

Approved For Release 2002/01/08 : CIA-RDP83T00573R000600070031-8

(cc in SAFE)

ODP 1854-77

14 September 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Acting Deputy Director for Administration
FROM : Clifford D. May, Jr.
Director of Data Processing
SUBJECT : Current SAFE Issues

In anticipation of your scheduled 15 September 1977 meeting with Mr. Blake and Dr. Stevens relative to SAFE, I have identified some current issues and talking points which may be useful to you.

Issue #1 - DCI Reply to the 30 August memo from the Director, DIA

Dr. Stevens appears to have some uneasy or uncertain feelings about going ahead on a joint CIA/DIA effort on SAFE/ADISS. Off the record he has been quoted as saying that the "DCI does not understand the problem." I am not sure what the "problem" is that he refers to, but I do know that he has offered no constructive alternative to the joint effort. If we want a "SAFE", the joint program appears to be the only feasible way of getting it. Harry Eisenbeiss reluctantly agrees with this. The good communications, harmonious relationship, and mutual trust that currently exist between CIA and DIA have grown out of a one year effort on the part of the project people of both organizations. The currently agreed management plan developed by these organizations is responsive to the direction of Congress and the expressed desires of Admiral Turner. I strongly recommend that the DCI concur in the D/DIA proposal and submit a response along the lines of the draft I sent you on 12 September. A joint effort can produce a successful system and save money in the process. All we need is an agreement and a commitment from both agencies.

Issue #2 - Awarding the SAFE Competitive Design Contracts

In response to the direction of the SAFE Steering Committee (chaired by Dr. Stevens), we completely revamped our approach to SAFE development last spring in order to lean more heavily on contractors for system design. We were

STATINTL
directed to contract with two contractors for a competitive system design. We have since solicited proposals from 27 suppliers, received proposals from 3 [REDACTED] and have gone through a comprehensive evaluation of these three proposals. We have now selected the two best proposals and are prepared to negotiate a contract with these two. We have the money and OL is prepared to move, contractually.

Some months ago we questioned whether we should proceed on this contract because of two significant events: 1) there was a substantial reduction in SAFE funding in FY-79 (this was the year that the development contract was to have been awarded; 2) it began to look like we would end up with some kind of joint development with DIA. In response to these questions, the SAFE Steering Committee met and reaffirmed the need to pursue the development of SAFE, but on a stretched schedule. However, there still was a question of whether the SAFE development effort could be merged with an ADIIS development should we be directed to go in that direction. We have been studying this question since.

Presently the SAFE Project Manager [REDACTED] and the STATINTL ADIIS Project Manager [REDACTED] have an agreed schedule of how the outputs of the ADIIS contract (requirements definition) can be folded into the SAFE competitive design contracts. The timing is such that this would occur about March of 1978. The SAFE contracting officer [REDACTED] has assured us that STATINTL expanding the scope of the SAFE contracts at that time to include the ADIIS input would not be a problem. There is no danger of getting "ripped off" by expanding the scope because we have two contractors involved in a highly competitive effort.

The formal request for negotiation of the two contracts is now "hung up" in the DDI's office. It is my understanding that Dr. Stevens will insist that the provision for handling ADIIS requirements must be incorporated in the initial contracts. If this is done, we will have to start over on the solicitation and evaluation, thus losing the \$1.5M in FY-77 money that is set aside for this purpose.

I recommend that we proceed on this contract with the commitment to modify it to incorporate ADIIS requirements if the joint development program is agreed to by all parties. Otherwise we would continue as a SAFE-only contract until the joint program issue is resolved.

Issue #3 - Should the Responsibility for SAFE Project Management be Transferred to the DDS&T

There are apparently closed-door discussions taking place between Dr. Stevens and Mr. Dirks on transferring SAFE project responsibility to OD&E. I do not know whether anyone from DDA has participated. We initiated the discussion of this issue at the last SAFE Steering Committee because we are tired of being sniped at by Mr. Dirks who constantly challenged our approach and cast doubt on the competence of my people. By raising the issue, we had hoped for an open discussion of the pros and cons of the current project management arrangements. Instead, we apparently prompted secret talks between Dr. Stevens and Mr. Dirks. Apparently they have already decided that DDA/ODP is not in the zone of consideration.

In my opinion, the current project management arrangement is highly effective. We have competent professionals and managers who have planned, organized, and carried out the SAFE development activities thus far in a fully satisfactory manner. We have established good working relationships and communications channels with DIA, OCR, OL, OC, OS and the other elements of ODP, which were difficult to establish and are producing good results. It is this kind of open, participative, cooperative team effort which will produce a successful joint SAFE system. I see nothing to be gained by changing this.

From their past record, we know how OD&E would go about the development. "Tell us what you want then go away and leave us alone and we'll deliver the system five years from now." I can guarantee you that this approach would fail. Even if they chose to take a participative approach with the other components, it would be disruptive and time consuming to reestablish the working channels that are currently being effectively employed by the present project office. There does not seem to be any justification for introducing this perturbation.

Finally, I would like to point out that the ODP mission is to build hardware/software systems for use by Agency components. I see no difference in SAFE than building GIMS, VM, TADS, or any other system we currently have except, perhaps, in scale. SAFE is a large project. But SAFE is basically an extension of Interim SAFE and other systems we have built for OCR. I see no reason for ODP not to be

responsible for bringing SAFE into the world. I would like to point out that we are properly using the services of the DDS&T in SAFE-related R&D areas that are appropriate to their mission. At our request, they are doing R&D work on rapid search machines, soft copy viewing stations, and Bus communications.

I strongly recommend that we resist transferring responsibility for SAFE development to DDS&T.

CDM

Clifford D. May, Jr.

TC.

Distribution:

Orig - adse
1 - ODP Registry
1 - O/D/ODP file SAFE
1 - O/D/ODP file DDA
1 - O/D/ODP chrono

O/D/ODP/CDMay:ee/9-14-77

STATINTL

Read by: 